

JUNE • 1946

The INTERNATIONAL TEAMSTER



The

LAUNDRY

Relax on Washday
LET THE
LAUNDRY
DO IT!

Official Magazine

THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS • CHAUFFEURS • WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA

How to Crack the Cotton Bloc

THE "cotton bloc" in Congress is responsible for most of our domestic troubles. It is composed of the reactionary southern Democrats who team up with the equally reactionary northern Republicans to destroy the living standards of the American people.

Naturally the Republicans must bear the bulk of the blame because they are more numerous. But without the cotton senators and congressmen, they would be only a noisy, dangerous minority.

The "cotton bloc" supplies the votes the Republicans need to kill legislation promoting full employment, higher wages, social security and public health.

It also supplies the votes the Republicans need to pass legislation restricting labor, removing price control, and reducing taxes for large corporations. Such legislation reduces living standards by reducing the purchasing power of the workers' wages.

The "cotton bloc" is interested chiefly in higher prices for cotton, even though that means higher prices for shirts, dresses, underwear, sox and other articles of wearing apparel.

When Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles restricted speculation in cotton, the southern congressmen attacked him and the whole price control program in retaliation. They are demanding inflation in cotton, even if it means inflation in everything.

The public can go naked while warehouses bulge with cotton being hoarded for higher prices, for all the "cotton bloc" cares.

The southerners in Congress, interested primarily in perpetuating the plantation-slave economy of the South, think that the public is helpless.

But it is not. It can strike back with devastating force. How? By simply boycotting cotton goods.

You can buy rayon underwear; rayon, nylon, silk or wool sox and shirts. You can reject articles made of cotton, even insisting on automobile tires made with rayon instead of cotton thread. Such tires wear longer and are safer.

If the public becomes cotton-conscious and refuses to buy anything made of cotton, the prices of cotton will tumble and the power of the "cotton bloc" in Congress will be broken. Many of them may be defeated for re-election because of the penalty their arrogance brought upon the South.

Labor can do this job by mobilizing its economic strength and diverting its buying power to cotton substitutes with which the market will soon be loaded.

"Patronize your friends," is the key to the success of the union label. And there is no union label on the cotton congressmen. They are apostles of the open shop.

You can beat them if you make the simple resolution and tell it to your friends:

DON'T BUY COTTON!

The INTERNATIONAL TEAMSTER



Official Magazine

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS
CHAUFFEURS . . . WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS

Vol. XLIII

JUNE, 1946

Number 7

President Tobin Advocates Industrial Peace	2
Economist Analyzes Old Age Benefit Systems	8
Railroads Seek to Evade Anti-Trust Laws	11
Child Expert Approves National Health Bill	13
What Does Taft Support Mean, Senator La Follette?	15
Criminal Charges Against Dairyman Postponed	16
Picture of Louisville Employer Who Ran Down Pickets	17
Motorist Crippled by Morgan Truck Sues for \$100,000	19
Green Assails Taft-Ball-Smith Health Bill Substitute	20
Here's What Food Subsidies Save You in Cash	21
Labor News Notes of the Month in the United States	22
Klan Rides Again as AFL Starts Organizing South	23
Wyatt Forecasts Billion-Dollar Construction Increase	24
How Congress Voted on OPA and Labor Legislation	25
Itemize Your Expense Accounts, Advises President Tobin	32
Scarcity of Housing Is National Danger Sign	Inside Back Cover

Office of Publication
222 E. Michigan Street.....Indianapolis 4, Ind.
Daniel J. Tobin, Editor
Thomas E. Flynn, Assistant Editor

Entered as second-class matter, February 23, 1906,
at the postoffice at Indianapolis, Ind., under the
Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage
provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 2, 1917,
authorized on July 8, 1918.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
Per Annum.....\$2.50 | Single Copies 25 Cents
(All Orders Payable in Advance)
Published Monthly

TRUSTEES
MILTON DOLL, 39 W. McMicken Ave., Cincinnati,
Ohio.
JAMES R. HOFFA, 2741 Trumbull Ave., Detroit,
Mich.
WILLIAM A. LEE, 220 S. Ashland Blvd., Chicago,
Ill.

GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

General President, **DANIEL J. TOBIN**, 222 E.
Michigan St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Acting General Sec'y-Treas, **JOHN F. ENGLISH**,
222 E. Michigan St., Indianapolis, Ind.
First Vice-President, **M. J. CASHAL**, Room 712,
265 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.
Second Vice-President, **JOHN P. McLAUGHLIN**,
536 Bryant St., San Francisco, Calif.
Third Vice-President, **D. J. MURPHY**, 4111 Forest
Park Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.
Fourth Vice-President, **JOHN J. CONLIN**, 89
Adams St., Hoboken, N. J.
Fifth Vice-President, **THOMAS J. FARRELL**, 39
W. McMicken Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Sixth Vice-President, **DAVE BECK**, 552 Denny
Way, Seattle, Wash.
Seventh Vice-President, **EDWARD CRUMBOCK**,
105 Spring Garden St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Eighth Vice-President, **SIDNEY L. BRENNAN**,
706 First Ave., N., Minneapolis, Minn.
Ninth Vice-President, **JOHN T. O'BRIEN**, 4217 S.
Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.

Employers Hear President Tobin

Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes Is Urged

Following is the text of an address delivered on May 8 by President Tobin as the guest of the Industrial Relations Council of Metropolitan Boston, in which he expressed optimism for the future of employer-labor relations throughout the country.

I AM indeed happy that I have had an opportunity to address this splendid gathering of business and labor men in this great, historic city of Boston.

I lived and worked in this vicinity for many years. Almost 40 years ago in this city I was elected to the position of general president of the Brotherhood of Teamsters. I agreed to take the position for one year, and I have continuously held that position ever since, and I think I hold a unique record. No man in the membership has ever been a candidate against me. In other words, I have been elected unanimously.

At that time, the Teamsters' Union had less than 28,000 members nationally, and was in debt for printing and other expenses totalling nearly \$40,000.

For the month of February of this year, a short month, I made a sworn affidavit published in our official journal, that the International Union had a paid-up membership on which we received dues numbering 773,510. This does not include perhaps 100,000 additional members who are not paid up in their dues.

Our financial statement ending March 31, 1946, sworn to by a certified public accountant, showed a balance of \$14,800,000 in government bonds and cash, with a real estate investment of about \$50,000. The International Union has something over \$12,000,000 in United States bonds.


The rate of revenues of the International Brotherhood has not been changed or in-

creased since 1920—26 years ago—although the cost of operation has quadrupled. The contributions to the International Union from local unions and members is 1 cent per day, or 30 cents per month.

In addition to being in charge of wage contracts and arbitration proceedings, the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters must also be a financier and see to it that the moneys of the International Union are properly invested. Permit me to state right here that in all the years of depression and disturbance, politically and financially, throughout our country and the world, that not one dollar of the International's money was ever lost in any financial transaction.

Our income from our government bonds this year will amount to about \$290,000—enough to pay the salaries and the running expenses of the International headquarters in Indianapolis and Washington.

I merely mention those matters to you for the purpose of trying to give you some understanding of the responsibilities of a labor man, but the most difficult problem of all for labor officials is to keep men working, and to try to stop unnecessary misunderstandings that lead towards demoralization of both the worker and the business, and to this end, your institution, the Industrial Relations Council of Metropolitan Boston, was created and is now functioning successfully, and I hope it will continue to function. Because of its desires, its moral honesty and



Daniel J. Tobin

the necessity for its existence, it must go onward and prosper as the years roll on.

All strikes cannot be prevented, because human nature is far from perfect, and we have sometimes individuals on both sides of the table who are perhaps living in the ages past, and are blinded to the necessity of understanding that the world is changing and that we cannot go back to the conditions prevailing 30 or 40 or 50 years ago.

One of the most miserable strikes that I had in my time was while I was working as a representative of the Teamsters' Union here in Boston. We were striking for a dollar a week increase in wages. Men driving trucks were averaging about \$14 a week on doubles, and \$11 or \$12 on single or one-horse trucks, working under a signed contract 11 hours per day, six days a week, straight time for overtime, which was difficult to collect. This was in April, 1907.

We had been endeavoring to reach an agreement, negotiating for three months, and eventually one-half of the employers agreed to the wage contract, which did not dare mention a closed shop, and the other half of the employers refused, and were tied up.

I saw men killed in that strike by dope fiends and drug addicts and drunkards who were brought in here to Boston and housed in the old steamship *Zelandea* at Congress Street bridge.

Some of the closest friends I had in the trucking business were tied up. Many of them went out of business as a result of that unfortunate incident, and then others were driven out of business as a result of a bond they had signed to the extent of \$1,000,000 that they would not attempt to settle with the union unless the union surrendered unconditionally.

As a result of those conditions then prevailing, which permitted employers' associations to bring in strike-breakers from one state to another, legislation was enacted preventing this, and such a condition could not obtain today in Boston, and I don't know any employers' association that would want to go back to those days of misunderstanding, ignorance and cruelty.

During the bad years of the depression—

the winter of 1929 until that of 1932 or 1933—when millions of men were starving and hungry, and when industry, especially the small business man, was driven up against the wall, and when large employers who had money refused to help support these hungry, strong, able, brainy working men and their families, labor pledged itself to see to it that no such condition would again come to our country if it was possible for the masses of the toilers to prevent it.

The first step was to elect those to office whom they believed understood the human side of life, those men who would tear themselves away from their early prejudices and from the influence of labor-hating corporations, and who would pledge themselves to see to it that laws were established in our country prohibiting as nearly as it could be prohibited, a repetition of the starvation and unemployed millions, which could lead to revolution.

If industry cannot take care of the millions of workers—the backbone of our nation—then something should be done in industry. In those lean years men and women were discouraged. Many corporations took advantage of the starving conditions of labor and penalized labor so severely that labor became filled with hatreds and determined to avenge those cruelties if ever they were able to do so.

I have seen men discharged for attempting to collect that which was due them in wages for their labor. The working man has only his labor to sell, and it is his duty and desire to get as much as he can possibly get for that strength and that brain his Creator has endowed him with.

When November, 1932, came around, the millions of workers voted for one they believed in—a great humanitarian—the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is not my purpose to make a political speech here, but I think you will be interested in this fact:

I was in the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee in New York—the Biltmore Hotel—endeavoring to help in the election of progressives, and until the middle of October of that year, we had no hope of electing the Democratic nominee over the Republican candidate, Mr. Hoover.

There was very little law then against enormous campaign contributions, but this condition existed: The Democratic National Committee had no money, obtained very few contributions, and the days were dark around headquarters. Chairman Farley would hold meetings in the evening, and all we had to do up until about October 14 was to exchange the bad news with each other.

Then there was a complete revulsion by and of the workers against capital, against the courts of many states and against the federal courts. Very little humanitarian legislation had been enacted by Congress from 1920 until 1932. There was a total disregard for the toilers and their families who had given their best blood in the first World War, and there existed a unified, solid organization—encouraged by certain employers in our country—to destroy labor and the unions.

At that time the membership of organized labor had fallen down to a little less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ million. It had never reached a higher membership than $5\frac{1}{4}$ million. Today it is estimated that there are about 12,000,000 organized workers, 7,000,000 of whom are paid-up members affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The other millions are supposed to be in the other organizations of labor, including some of the railroad brotherhoods.

I stated in an address delivered in New York in 1931 that because of the injustice prevailing, that the large employers of the nation were bringing about the destruction of freedom of industry. In passing, let me state that I am, up to now—and I trust I will not be compelled to change my opinion—a firm believer in the principle of free enterprise in trade and business. I do not want, as one labor man, to run the business of the nation or the business of our employers.

We have all we can do to run the enormous membership we represent. Let industry and capital take care of its own finances and its own management.

Some men who believe themselves—and they may be right—to be more advanced than I am, substantially disagree with me,

but I have always had a faculty of having a great many disagree with me. That's the price you pay for the right to express yourself and to guide your people, which, after all, is my job. But in guiding my people, I must keep before me the best interests of this great nation, which has given men like me, and millions of others, the opportunity of freedom of thought, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

I know what it is to be in need, and to work unlimited hours, and to raise a family of five or six children and to go hungry trying to get them the education that I, myself, could not obtain. I am not speaking without knowing the problems of business, of government, but especially of the toilers of the nation.

Those employers' association which I had opportunity to contact and to address during the political revolution of 1932, I warned that the day would come when labor would demand laws that might embarrass or set back industry.

In addressing a meeting of employers in the Palmer House in Chicago during the month of August in 1932, I advised them then that with all the advantages that the employers had obtained by judicial decisions and otherwise, labor would be successful in the passage of laws that would free it from its shackles. And so it was that we got the NRA first to protect in a small way the right of men to belong to any union of their own choosing; and from out of that fumbled mess of the NRA, which gave labor its first breath of freedom, came the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, commonly called the Wagner Act.

The Wagner Act has given labor only the just and American freedom to which it is entitled. When the Wagner Act was first passed, we had very little trouble because there were no dual organizations of labor. Fully 50 per cent of the disagreements and dissatisfaction with the Wagner Act have been due to jurisdictional misunderstandings between the American Federation of Labor and the CIO.

After that came the rebuilding of the Supreme Court of the United States by the President of the United States. Men were

put on the Supreme Court who were living in the age of today and not in the ages past, and they interpreted the laws from the standpoint of judicial training and human understanding. In other words, they did not read into the law an intention to restrict labor, as was done by former judges of the court who were always sympathetic with large corporations and disinclined to understand the throbbing of the hearts of the masses of the people.

And so it is that industry has been confronted in recent years, as a result of the organization of the workers, with many difficulties.

The workers were prevented from organizing in the employments of the largest institutions of our country. They were discharged and discriminated against for belonging to unions.

Spy systems prevailed in the employment of the automobile industry, and in the steel industry, and in many other large industries.

Pennsylvania at one time maintained a strong-arm police organization to brutally butcher the workers during strikes. That now has all been abolished, and the days of Penrose and Mellon are past and gone.

If the large corporations had permitted the lawful organization of the toilers in the years when corporate wealth was in power everywhere, some of the miseries that we have undergone in recent years might have been avoided.

You cannot take in men inexperienced in the affairs of labor or in handling large groups of men and train them overnight. If any labor union that has been organized in recent years has made its mistakes, it is entitled to its percentage of mistakes, because capital, industry and government also made many mistakes, most of which could have been avoided.

There must be some means established, not through force, or compulsion, to prevent in the future the serious disagreements between industry and labor, in which the government has been considerably embarrassed and inconvenienced.

Your organization here represented, the Industrial Relations Council of Metropolitan Boston, may perhaps be the incentive,

in a small way, in leading other states, and perhaps the nation, towards the establishment of institutions where men can sit around the table and try to adjust their misunderstandings.

Strikes and bitter disagreements between capital and labor cannot be prevented by legislation. The Smith-Connally Act is a joke insofar as stopping strikes. Witness what has been going on in recent months.

I have repeatedly said in the columns of our official magazine, which reaches almost 700,000 monthly that most strikes could be prevented.

Without unnecessarily eulogizing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters—it has its troubles, plenty of them—I say that if we can be successful with three-quarters of a million members in keeping the wheels rolling during the months of the war, and if we can be successful in showing to the public today that out of that large membership there are less than 400 men on strike throughout the entire nation because we have reached understandings and agreements with our employers, then other labor unions and other employers can do the same thing.

In recent months all Boston and vicinity could have been disturbed and gravely inconvenienced if we did not insist that our people and their employers leave the settlement of their serious dispute to an unprejudiced board for settlement.

There is no use in going back and stating that business should run itself, and that the same laws applying to corporations should apply to labor unions. That's part of a system of injecting poison into the minds of the public.

Why should 500 men in a labor union with small funds, the funds belonging to those who contributed same, men who have nothing but their sweat and their blood to sell, be compared to inanimate things, such as the enormous machinery of a motor manufacturing institution, or to the railroads with their iron and steel locomotives and rails? Those things have no life. That's property created by the hand and brain of man.

Lest we forget, the United States courts

have said labor is not a commodity or an article of commerce. On the other hand, labor has but its life and its blood and its brain to sell, and those are its only assets.

We are the one country where freedom and tolerance and understanding prevails and where there is still the incentive for honest business to continue to prosper.

I am a firm believer that our government should not tax industry out of business. By that I mean honest industry that gives an accounting of its finances and that does not permit the board of directors to quadruple the salaries of relatives of the officials—in other words, corporations that do business in accordance with the law without falsifying their reports.

Such law-abiding industry and business should be encouraged, and free enterprise can be maintained in this, our country, for which all men, real Americans, were ready to die in the recent conflict, which had at stake the freedom we believe in.

I want to point out, however, that the trend is the other way at this time. Nearly all the nations of the world have gone so far to the extreme left that business is practically taken over by governments. Countries on our side in the last great world struggle have, since the ending of the war, taken over business.

There is no freedom of enterprise in Russia, and I say this without any bitterness—that's the right of Russia to decide its own affairs. But I resent any agents of Russia endeavoring to tell the United States what its form of government should be.

France has no business left, and a government that is practically helpless.

Germany will never again be allowed to come back to the industrial world where that nation may become a menace to the freedom of the peoples of the earth.

Japan will be placed in the same position as Germany, and there is a great danger that China and many other countries in the Orient will follow the pattern of Russia, and destroy, because of poverty, the principle of free enterprise.

And let us take the one other large country that I have not mentioned up to now—a country that speaks our language and that

gave us some of its greatest men, that helped us to establish many of our industries—England. Where do they stand today on free enterprise?

I know Prime Minister Atlee very well, and Ernest Bevin has been a close associate of mine for 30 years. I know that those men are not extremely radical, but they were elected by an overwhelming majority on purely a Socialist platform. Since their election, they have gradually taken over business.

Imagine our federal government taking full control, permanently, of the banking institutions of America. Yet England has gone further. Government has complete control of the mining industry and the ship-building industry; and now the question is under consideration of the government taking over the railroads. And that is not going to be the end of the taking over control of private industry. In many instances in England, industry has been anxious to have the government take it over. The business men of England have been almost totally impoverished.

At a dinner in the Savoy Hotel in London tendered to me by Lord Beaverbrook, at which there were present many of the great industrialists of England, I was advised that there were less than 700 men in England who had a net income of \$25,000 a year. Before the war, there were 7,500. That was a little over two years ago. The other day I read a report where there were less than 140 individuals in England who had a net income of \$25,000 after paying their taxes.

I have read statistics on the incomes in the United States, and if you will endeavor to find out, you will be astounded when you get the information of the number of individuals in our country who have a \$25,000 net income after all taxes are paid. It runs into the thousands.

I merely make these statements for the purpose of informing the employers and the leaders of business throughout our nation of the necessity of reaching some understanding whereby both sides will stop beating their heads against the wall.

If we can't agree, let us set up a mutual

institution that will make a decision, and let us both live to that decision.

Don't tell me that this can't be done. Yes, I know it is discouraging. You are going to say to me, "What about so and so who won't sit down in conference?" and I can repeat that to you on the other side a thousand times over, but that's not the final answer.

We have built this nation to one of the greatest nations in the world. We have had our setbacks, and we have come forward with greater strength. We saved the world through our accomplishments in this last great conflict, which preserved, temporarily at least, the right to live like decent men and women.

When the President of the United States stated in the first months of the war that he wanted 50,000 airplanes a year and we were then making 10,000, 90 per cent of the people of our country ridiculed that statement and took it as a joke.

Before the end of the war we were not only making 50,000, but 103,000 airplanes per year. We flooded the world with the labor of our hands and our brains. We sent whole factories for the production of synthetic rubber tires over to Russia, and those are only one or two of the instances that resulted in destroying the monsters who scoffed at freedom and justice — Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito.

So again I repeat, don't tell me it can't be done. There is nothing impossible to the brain and the manhood of the citizenship of the United States.

I am not discouraged, and I have faith in the future in spite of this reaction that has swept our country in recent months, where labor and industry have not been working together and are at each others' throats. This situation is due to the stored-up power and the suppressed energy of the toilers during the years of the war. From out of this experience of today will come a better day and better understandings, and Americans, I repeat, will find a way. They always have.

No strike has ever been lost to either capital or labor because from out of those serious disagreements come better understandings for the future. I am optimistic enough to believe that the day is not far off when we will find a way to keep men working and industry healthy under our system of free enterprise, serving our communities, serving our national government, serving the world.

Then the dark clouds of fear and apprehension will pass from over our country and men and women whose greatest desire is the preservation of our American institutions and way of life will meet each other with open minds and open hearts. For working toward this end I want to congratulate this organization, the Industrial Relations Council of Metropolitan Boston.

Let me remind you that in the darkest hour of England a poet wrote these words,

*"There'll be bluebirds over
The white cliffs of Dover,
Tomorrow, just you wait and see."*

Akron Man Likes Article on Russian "Holy War"

George Grisak, Jr., of Akron, Ohio, is not a Teamster, but he sees this magazine regularly. He has friends who are Teamsters. Last month he wrote to commend us, particularly for the article in the April issue exposing the motives of those who agitate war with Russia in order to gain control of Russian resources.

"I'm a 100 per cent American—no Communist strings at all, belong to no political party," Mr. Grisak wrote. "Your editors

are 100 per cent O. K. as far as I'm concerned. Keep up the good work. You are really informing the American worker what it's all about. I especially liked your article in the April issue about the holy war for Russia's resources. You see, I have two young boys who will be ripe for that profitable sneak play."

This was the same article given national circulation in the daily press by Edwin A. Lahey, widely-read newspaper columnist.

Kaplan Analyzes Old Age Benefits

Compares Social Security with Railroad Retirement Act

BY DAVID KAPLAN

Chief Economist, International Brotherhood of Teamsters

THE passage of the Social Security Act ten years ago marked a milestone in the development of the right of workers to protection against the hazards of unemployment and indigent old age.

Before social security legislation was passed, the only plans in private industry to provide for the retirement of aged workers with regular payments of income were private pension plans.

These plans were under the complete control of the employers and could be modified or abolished at the employer's sole discretion.

They were often used as a club to keep employees from joining a union.

The employee's right to a pension depended entirely upon the good will of his employer and in that sense it was a gratuity instead of a payment to which he had a right.

The plans adopted as a result of social security legislation are on an entirely different basis. The workers have a right to the pension upon retirement, a right earned by their years of service and by their contributions to the pension fund.

There are two federally administered old age benefit plans that cover workers in private industry—the plan set up by the Railroad Retirement Act and the plan established by the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Section of the Social Security Act.

The Railroad Retirement Act covers all employees engaged in work for railroad companies; the employees of the Railway Express Agency, Inc.; and the employees of freight forwarding companies engaged in consolidating less-than-carload shipments for railroad transportation. This question of coverage is important because the benefits, the eligibility provisions, and the contributions made by the employees through

payroll taxes vary very considerably under the two acts.

The Railroad Retirement Act provides that a person 65 years of age may retire at an annuity paid by the Railroad Retirement Board based on the following formula:

2% of the first \$50 of average monthly wage (\$1.00)

1½% of the next \$100 (\$1.50)

1% of the next \$150 (\$1.50) (making a maximum of \$4.00) multiplied by years of service.

Three hundred dollars per month and 30 years of service is the maximum used in calculating the benefit. Thus a maximum annuity of \$120 per month is provided ($\$4 \times 30$ equals \$120).

The Act further provides that if the employee does not retire at 65 years of age, his monthly annuity payments will be reduced 1/15th for each year after 65 that he remains in railroad employment.

This is qualified to the extent that an employee can remain at work beyond 65 years and up to 70 years of age without facing reduction in his monthly annuity payments if there is an agreement between him and the railroad requiring his services which is approved by the Railroad Retirement Board, providing for the extension of his years of service for each specific year.

Likewise employees may retire after 50 and before 65 years of age and receive an annuity, but if they do so they must accept a reduction of 1/15th of their monthly payments for each year that they are less than 65 years of age.

To provide funds for the financing of these payments, under the Railroad Retirement Act, Congress passed what is known as the Carriers' Taxing Act, which imposed an income tax on the employees and an

excise tax of a similar amount on the employers.

The employees' share of the tax is deductible from his pay envelope and is payable on all wages not in excess of \$300 per month.

The excise tax on the employer is likewise limited to \$300 a month on the wages of each employee.

The employer is made liable for payment to the government of both the employer's and the employee's share of the tax.

For the years 1937, 1938 and 1939, the tax amounted to $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent on both the employer and each employee, or a total of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of taxable payroll.

For the years 1940, 1941 and 1942 it rose to 3 per cent for each, or a total of 6 per cent of taxable payroll.

In the years 1943, 1944 and 1945 it rose to $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent for each, or a total of $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of taxable payroll.

In the year 1946 and continuing for the years 1947 and 1948 the tax is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for each, or a total of 7 per cent of taxable payroll.

In the year 1949 it will rise to $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent for each, or a total of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of taxable payroll. Under the present version of the Carriers' Tax Act, that is as high as the tax can go.

Employees covered under the Social Security Act may retire at 65 years of age. The benefits for workers covered under this Act vary from a minimum of \$10 per month for an unmarried worker to a maximum of \$85 a month, in the case of an insured married worker with dependents.

The actual monthly benefits are based on earnings and length of service in covered employments, but no earnings in excess of \$250 per month are considered, nor any years of service before 1936.

The most important factor in the calculation of the monthly benefit under the Old Age and Survivors Insurance provisions is called the primary benefit, which is the amount payable to a worker without dependents and is derived by the following formula:

Forty per cent of the first \$50 in average monthly wages, or \$20.

Ten per cent of the remaining amount up

to \$200 additional or a limit of \$20 more, which makes a total of \$40; with an additional 1 per cent of the amount thus obtained (which in this case is 40 cents) for each year in which the insured worker earned \$200 or more in covered employment between the years 1936 or his 22d birthday, whichever is later, to the date he reaches the age of 65 (making a possible 42 years at 40 cents, or \$16.80).

Thus, the highest benefit payable to a single person without dependents is \$40 plus \$16.80, or \$56.80 per month.

Supplementary benefits are provided for the wife of the insured worker if she has reached the age of 65 and for dependent children under 16 years of age (or under 18, if regularly attending school) amounting to one-half the worker's benefit for each dependent. But the total benefits payable for all cannot exceed \$85 per month, or twice the primary benefit, or 80 per cent of his monthly wage, whichever is least.

The contributions to provide the finances for the annuities under the Social Security Act are collected through an income tax on employees based on all his wages which are not in excess of \$3,000 a year and an equal excise tax on employers based on payroll not exceeding \$3,000 a year for any employee.

The employee's tax is deducted from the employee's wages by the employer, and the employer is made responsible for paying both his share and his employee's share into the United States treasury.

The tax was supposed to start at 1 per cent for each of the parties in 1937 and automatically move up to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1940; 2 per cent in 1943; $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1946 and to the top of 3 per cent by 1949.

As a result of an action by Congress in each year since the rise was to take place, the increase in the tax was suspended and the amount kept at 1 per cent. Failure on the part of Congress to take action to suspend the rise would automatically bring the tax to the original amount stipulated in the act, which by 1949 would amount to 3 per cent on taxable earnings and payrolls for both employers and the employees, making a total levy of 6 per cent on the taxable amount of payroll.

These two old age benefit systems comprise the largest permanent insurance system in the world covering now over 85 million individual worker accounts. These systems, though a long step ahead in providing social security in the United States, are now badly in need of extension and liberalization.

Millions of needy workers are not yet covered, including such groups as agricultural workers, domestic service, seamen and workers in social agencies, among others.

The benefit provisions of both were based

on ideas of wage loss through retirement in the last half of the decade of the thirties, and are now far from adequate. Since that time yearly wages increased more than 50 per cent, and the cost of living has risen considerably.

Recommendations to extend the old age insurance systems to uncovered workers and to liberalize the benefits have been made by organized labor and also by the Social Security Board and the Railroad Retirement Board and undoubtedly will command attention from Congress.

Full Employment Needs Production

THE chart below shows the relation of production since V-J Day to full employment. In March, production had risen to within 30 per cent of the point necessary to provide both full employment and sufficient goods to satisfy public demand.


Until peacetime production reaches the 200 point on the chart, it is necessary to keep price controls. On the chart the figure 100 represents the average production be-

tween 1935 and 1939. Thus production must rise to double that figure before the OPA can be eliminated without fear of inflation and depression.

Production, according to the chart, which was prepared by the American Federation of Labor, shows that production began to go down in April.

No figures as to the extent of decline are yet available.

PRODUCTION STARTS UPWARD TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT LEVEL



Source: Federal Reserve Board index.

Railroads Dodge Anti-Trust Laws

Help Comes from Bulwinkle, a Congressman, That Is

BY TRAVIS K. HEDRICK

A LOBBY that spends at least \$5,000,000 a year on its work in Congress is responsible for the success enjoyed to date by the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536), removing the nation's railroads from certain features of the federal anti-trust law as to rate fixing.

The lobby is financed by the Association of American Railroads.

Congressman Alfred L. Bulwinkle of North Carolina introduced H. R. 2536 in the House on March 8, 1945, and it was passed by the House on December 10, 1945, by a 277-to-45 vote. It is now in the Senate.

The bill is aimed at limiting prosecution of railroads under the federal anti-trust act for joining together in rate-making agreements.

The Bulwinkle bill permits the railroads to enter into rate-fixing compacts "in furtherance of national transportation policy." This is the loophole.

Opponents of the measure hope to delay action on it in the Senate until the U. S. Supreme Court can decide two major anti-trust suits against the principal railroads of the country. One of these was filed by the Department of Justice and the other by the State of Georgia. Both charge the rail carriers with conspiracy to set rates in favor of eastern interests.

The federal suit is against 47 western roads, J. P. Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., two of the country's largest investment houses, and the names of the defendants pretty well tell the nature of the government's charges.

In the case of Georgia, Gov. Ellis Arnall of that state started the suit against the Pennsylvania railroad and others, charging a conspiracy existed to hold his state's economy "in a state of arrested development" through rate discrimination in favor of eastern manufacturers, producers and shippers.

The potent and well-heeled Association of American Railroads has for years enjoyed

practically complete control over rates and rate-making in this country, despite the legal power held over them by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In actual practice, the ICC has neither the time nor the facilities to review railroad rates. The AAR sees that rates are properly posted for the proper 30 days and then they simply go into effect.

Coercion on the part of the AAR prevents individual railroads from lowering freight or passenger rates at present, and the two suits now in our highest court would help do away with these practices.

But if the Bulwinkle bill becomes law, all competition between roads will be eliminated because of the authority it gives the rail carriers to get together on tariffs.

Although up to the present most business men and business organizations fail to see the light, the power to fix rates is the power to control a basic, competitive factor in every American industry.

As Gov. Arnall stated, the power to control transportation costs is the "power to dictate initially the location of every industrial enterprise and subsequently the success or failure of these enterprises."

In other words, the Bulwinkle idea is to legalize private control in the field of public control of railroads, and to do it without elected officials through men and agencies who have no responsibility to the public at large.

The present situation, with the eastern roads and eastern bankers in the saddle, is robbing everybody but those in control. A couple of examples of how the business is worked now are in order.

Suppose a southern railroad wanted to put in a special low week-end rate for farmers to go shopping. It files its rate with the AAR, posts it, but gets blackballed by the association. It then appeals and the eastern roads object, so again it is disapproved and

the southern railroad must take the rate case up to the Washington office of the AAR.

Meanwhile the ICC must wait for the 30-day notice to run out before it can move—but with thousands of new rates continually pouring in, the ICC is engulfed in the work of the AAR, a private organization, and actually receives only AAR “approved rates” for consideration.

During the war period, for instance, to cite another example, there was an ammunition tariff in effect which was filed with the ICC long ago. It called for a rate of \$3.35 a hundred pounds from Ohio to the west coast, giving the government the advantage of the land-grant provisions in the ICC act.

But Section 22 of the ICC act gives the roads authority to grant the government a “special” reduced rate. So the statistical boys got out their slide rules on this ammunition business and came up with a “special low rate” of \$4.09 a hundred pounds.

What this trick business meant to the railroads can be seen from the fact that the “special rate” meant an extra profit of exactly \$750 a carload on ammunition. If you use this as a measuring rod on the number of ammunition carloads poured to our ports, you can see why the carriers are interested in Mr. Bulwinkle’s bill and afraid of the Supreme Court’s forthcoming decisions.

And then this same sort of statistical rate juggling worked just as well for the financial benefit of the railroads on landing mats, on tanks, command cars, jeeps and other materiel of war.

The Bulwinkle bill prohibits the railroads

from making rates with carriers of different classes (i.e., truck lines, pipe lines, etc.) and the following may explain why:

There was a proposal to build a new type boxcar that could be shifted to a truck from the siding. It never got anywhere because the AAR warned its sponsors to “lay off.” The AAR wanted no part of a cooperative arrangement with the motor truck industry.

Suppose the sponsoring line had insisted on its individual rights . . . and gone ahead. The act would have been the signal for the old AAR squeeze and precious little freight would be routed thereafter over the offending line.

Obviously the anti-trust act needs clarification from the Supreme Court. A liberal ruling in the people’s interest will curtail the work of the AAR and help business, help shippers, labor and the general public.

Back of the bill are the railroads, shipping associations, many state regulatory bodies, the ICC and many chambers of commerce.

Its opponents include Attorney General Tom C. Clark, Gov. Arnall and most of organized labor, including the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which reversed its position May 3 after first indicating approval of the bill.

Despite the rich railroad lobby, the Bulwinkle bill is running into tougher going in the Senate than it had in the House.

Opponents believe they can keep the Bulwinkle measure off the floor for some time yet, and that if it does appear, Bulwinkle and the AAR will have difficulty in recognizing their own brain-child.

Labor’s Enemies Prepare for 1946 Elections

Under any circumstances, labor faces a rough road in the future.

In the last campaign many isolationist enemies of labor were defeated and the present Congress is not as bad as the last one was. But we cannot afford to sit back and relax.

Already our enemies are collecting enormous campaign funds for the 1946 elections. They think they can elect a reactionary

Congress which will throw out the reforms inaugurated by President Roosevelt.

It is up to us to retain our interest in politics. We must watch the records of the men and women now there and on those records we must support or oppose them next November. If your congressman knows you are watching how he votes, he will vote better than if you paid no attention to him.

—*The International Laundry Worker.*

Child Expert Indorses Health Bill

Refutes "Socialized Medicine" Charge of Reactionaries

UNDER the proposed national health bill (the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill) medical care and health services could be brought within the reach of all mothers and all children, everywhere in the country, Dr. Martha M. Eliot, associate chief of the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, told the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, holding hearings on the bill.

Dr. Eliot spoke in support of the bill in its entirety and particularly its maternal and child-health and crippled children's provisions, seeing in the latter the way to build upon existing programs now in operation in the states under the Social Security Act. These programs, which are administered by state health agencies under plans approved by the Children's Bureau, are severely limited by lack of funds, the total appropriation for such health services under the Social Security program being less than \$10,000,000 a year.

Federal, state and local planning, as well as more money, will be needed if services are to be made accessible to all, Dr. Eliot repeatedly pointed out. "Letting fathers and mothers struggle unsuccessfully to find what care they can for their children is not good enough." The proposed legislation, she maintained, offers the way in which parents and professional workers can be brought together in the service of children.

Insurance features of the national health bill will spread the cost of medical care so that insured parents can afford to buy care for their children. The maternal and child-health section, with amendments introduced by Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, will "make state and local governments responsible for seeing that care is within reach of all mothers and children everywhere," she testified.

Referring to the opposition claims that the quality of care under the national health program will deteriorate under "socialized medicine," Dr. Eliot pointed out that "the

Children's Bureau experience in administering medical care programs is that the quality of care can actually be improved."

Throughout her testimony Dr. Eliot stressed the inequalities in health services and medical care available to mothers and children in this country.

"Under the conditions that exist today, the prospect that the baby's mother will live through child birth, that the baby will be born alive and will survive and grow into a sturdy, well child, varies markedly by reason of where he lives and the income of his family and his race."

One-half of the children in the United States, the committee was told, live in 32 states which get only one-third of the national income. One-fourth of the children live in the southeastern states that have only 12 per cent of the national income.

"Rural areas are at a particular disadvantage," continued Dr. Eliot. "In 1941, farm families had 29 per cent of the children in the United States but only 11 per cent of the income. Their purchasing power in terms of health and medical care for mothers and children has necessarily been low."

Other evidence of the need for planning for the better provision of maternal and child-health services cited by Dr. Eliot follows:

1. In 1942, 40 per cent of the counties lacked the service of a full-time public-health unit.

2. One-third of the counties had no public-health nurse.

3. Three out of four rural counties have no regular maternity clinics and two out of three rural counties have no regular monthly child-health conferences.

4. For each 750 people there should be the equivalent of one physician, including general practitioners and specialists. In 1940, a pre-war year, 1,642 counties had only one doctor for from 1,000 to 2,000

people. In some counties the ratio was one doctor to 3,000 or more people.

5. Highly trained personnel, the "experts" and the "specialists," tend to concentrate in urban areas. In 1941, for example, only 4 per cent of the certified pediatricians (children's doctors) were in communities of less than 10,000 population, and in rural areas where 60 per cent of the children live, while 38 per cent were in cities of 500,000 or more, where only 14 per cent of the children live.

"The opportunity for adequate income for specialists is greater in the city than in the country," Dr. Eliot said. "Hospital facilities can be had when needed in the larger cities and there is readier access to professional consultation and to the services of other specialists. General medical practitioners and dentists also tend to settle in cities, for the same reason.

"Practice in rural areas must be made more attractive, and arrangements for group practice made possible. The doctor and the dentist in the country must be assured an adequate income. There must be arrangements to make specialists and consultation services available as they are needed."

She referred to the hospital and health center construction bill now before Congress and pointed out that priority should be given to construction of general hospitals and health centers in rural areas.

"This is an important step in providing care in rural areas. It will also help in attracting doctors, dentists, and other professional personnel to live and practice there."

She also discussed the need to find ways of training a sufficient number of professional people. "We now have about 2,500 pediatricians, against an estimated need of at least 7,400. We need probably 5,000 more obstetricians. We ought to have 1,000 more orthopedists. We need 34,000 dentists

trained in children's dentistry. We have 19,000 public-health nurses and need 50,000 more. We need at least 15,000 additional graduate nurses for institutional and private duty. We need 10,000 additional psychiatrists to expand services for children, particularly into areas now without them." Twenty-five states, she said, have no child-guidance clinics whatsoever.

"We must pool our resources," she continued, "so that children, no matter where they live or what the family circumstances, can have the chance of a healthy start in life open to them. To do anything less is wasteful of our future manpower and womanpower."

"A complete child-health service, excluding the cost of dental care and treatment for illness, would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$8 a child per year, or less than three cents a day per child.

"If we add dental care, beginning when the child is three years old, and continue it through the school years, we would add another three cents a day. Add to this the cost of medical care, including care of minor and major illness for children up to 18 years, and the care of crippled children, and we come out with a total of approximately 13 cents a day per child.

"Since introduction of the national health bill last fall, 13,500 babies and 1,300 mothers died whose lives might have been saved, and each day the debate goes on we lose 85 more babies and eight more mothers needlessly.

"I am not saying that the lives of all children could be saved or that perfect health is attainable for all. I am saying it is wrong for 100 children to die of a disease if 50 could be saved. I am saying that no child should live in a state of ill health who could be cured or made better. This is the goal we have not reached. This is the job with which we are confronted."

514th Teamster War Death Reported by Mother

The 514th Teamster reported to have lost his life in the wartime military service of his country is Technical Sergeant Clinton J. Poole of Local No. 251, Cranston, R. I.

His death was announced in a letter from

his mother, Mrs. F. W. Poole, to President Tobin. Sgt. Poole was killed in action in Belgium on December 28, 1944. He was serving with the 38th Field Artillery of the Second Division.

What Does This Mean, La Follette?

Labor Perturbed by Taft Backing in Wisconsin

DID the Republican party in Wisconsin go conservative by rejecting Senator Robert M. La Follette?

Or did it go progressive by rejecting Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio?

These questions have been puzzling labor since the surprising action of the Wisconsin state Republican convention last month in turning down La Follette's request for indorsement by the almost unanimous vote of 2,328 to 1.

Still more surprising was the unveiling of Taft as La Follette's chief champion. A letter from Taft indorsing La Follette was widely circulated among the delegates on the convention floor and while it created intense interest, it did La Follette no good, unless it got him that one lone vote.

To find Taft supporting La Follette, to the extent of interceding in the convention of another state, is a startling and disturbing incident.

Taft is recognized as the leader of the Senate reactionaries. La Follette has been accepted as one of the Senate's most progressive members, although he has failed to fill the shoes of his famous father as a liberal leader.

If Taft is becoming more liberal as the campaign approaches, it is an encouraging sign. But Taft's letter to the Wisconsin Republicans did not indicate any unsuspected liberality.

In fact, it exposed him as opposing Senator Wayne L. Morse of Oregon, one of the new leaders attempting to make the Republican party progressive. Morse is a staunch friend of labor.

Because of his allegiance to labor, Morse has encountered bitter opposition among the reactionary Republicans, like Taft.

In his letter indorsing La Follette, Taft said that he expected La Follette would wind up closer to him than to Morse. This means that La Follette is wavering between the reactionary and progressive wings of the Republican party, according to Taft.

But La Follette did not repudiate Taft's letter. Does this mean that La Follette, too, expects to start his next term of office in Taft's corner, if he is re-elected this fall?

Taft's prophecy was disturbingly clear. It was a blow to labor, which has always counted on the unwavering liberality of La Follette.

Of course, labor will not take Taft's word for that, any more than labor will take Taft's word on legislation. Taft talks from the wrong side of his mouth, so far as labor is concerned.

Some time has passed, however, since Taft adopted La Follette and forecast his future actions. La Follette has said nothing. If Taft is wrong, let La Follette tell us so, immediately and emphatically.

We're listening, senator!

Alabama Liberal Congressman in Hard Fight

Union members who believe primary elections are unimportant received a scare in Alabama last month when liberal Congressman Luther Patrick of Birmingham narrowly escaped defeat.

It was originally reported he had been defeated but he finally won by less than 100 votes. He must now survive a runoff election on June 4. Patrick has a voting record in Congress which has won him the

support of all factions of labor. He was singled out for special recognition by Thomas E. Flynn, executive assistant to President Tobin, at the recent meeting of the Southern Conference of Teamsters.

Mr. Flynn told the Teamsters that in addition to defeating its enemies, labor must re-elect its friends or it will be continuously harassed by a reactionary majority in Congress.

Fenley Case Postponed in Court

Louisville Dairyman to Face Criminal Charges on June 4

See Picture on Opposite Page.

CRIMINAL charges against R. B. Fenley, Louisville dairy operator, for running down two Teamster pickets on March 19, have been postponed until June 4.

Fenley's case came up in court on May 14 but was postponed until June 4 on the motion of Edwin Willis, attorney for Local No. 783 of Louisville.

The attorney requested postponement because of the condition of Raymond Basham, one of the pickets hit by Fenley's car. Basham was critically injured when the

front and rear wheels of Fenley's car passed over him.

On May 14, the day Fenley's case was before the court, Basham underwent an operation to draw fluid from his lungs. As Basham is the principal witness against Fenley, the union moved to defer the case until he is well enough to appear.

Archie K. Dorr, the other picket hit by Fenley's car, was also arraigned on May 14, charged with "banding together to commit a felony." His case was also postponed until

(Continued on Page 18)



THEY SAW IT HAPPEN—A group of the loyal Teamster pickets on duty at the Fenley Dairy who witnessed the injuries of two other pickets when they were run down by R. B. Fenley in his automobile.

Arrested Louisville Employer



FENLEY IS ARRESTED—This shows R. B. Fenley, operator of the struck Louisville dairy, as he appeared at police headquarters following the hit-run attack on two Teamster pickets. The pickets were crossing the street when Fenley's car, speeding down the wrong side of the street, hit them.

(Continued from Page 16)

June 4, as Basham is a witness for Dorr in that case.

Secretary James A. Jackson of Local No. 783 reported that the union is still picketing the Fenley dairy and has reduced its business to 5 per cent of normal.

The strike against the dairy was called on March 4 after more than a year of effort to induce Fenley to pay the same wages as other Louisville dairies. Fenley flatly rejected orders of the War Labor Board to pay the same wages as other Louisville dairies and refused to even consider wage increases.

The strike was finally called as a last resort.

On March 19 Basham and Dorr were crossing a street near the dairy when Fenley backed his car out of a service station and plunged it directly toward the two Teamsters.

Fenley drove down the wrong side of the street, hitting Dorr and throwing him clear of the car. Dorr escaped with bruises and abrasions.

Basham, however, was hit squarely and grasped the hood of the car to avoid being thrown under the wheels. Fenley did not stop or even slow down. Instead he rushed on at continually increasing speed.

Finally, after hanging on for 70 feet, Basham tried to hurl himself clear. Instead,

he fell beneath the car and both the front and rear wheels passed over him.

Fenley did not stop and later drove to the police station, where he reported he had been "scattering pickets" and that one of them "got in my way."

Fenley was charged with assault and battery with an automobile, reckless driving, and failing to stop and render aid. It was on these charges he was arraigned May 14 and which were postponed until June 4.

In addition to the criminal charges, Basham is pressing a suit for damages against Fenley. He was so seriously injured that for a time it was thought he would not survive.

Neither Basham nor Dorr was on the picket line at the time Fenley ran them down. Basham had been to the toilet at the service station from which Fenley backed his car. Dorr was on his way there and the two men were within a few feet of each other, approaching from opposite directions, when Fenley's car bore down on them.

In spite of the fact that he was struck by a car speeding down the wrong side of the street, Dorr was arrested by the Louisville police. They evidently consider it a crime for a union man to be around when an employer goes berserk.

Most People Are Holding Their War Bonds

We do not pretend to be prophets or the sons of prophets, but we do have confidence in America. We believe this applies in equal measure to all save a few reactionaries who are in the habit of "viewing with alarm," and can't change those habits.

The evidence that this is true lies in the fact that an extremely small percentage of the small people are cashing in their bonds, the banks are loaded with safety deposits and despite our great national debt, forced by the exigencies of war—the people have faith in their money, their bonds and the fiscal stability of this nation.

As long as this is true—as long as confidence is maintained by the small stockholder in this nation, our worries are in

large part those of the mind and not of the substance. Everyone realizes that we must move from a war economy to a peacetime economy. Adjustments will have to be made. Waste (which is synonymous to war) will have to be eliminated. The philosophy of get the job done and to hell with the cost must of necessity be discarded in a competitive field of activity.

Some of our workers who drew top pay as specialists will have to find their proper bracket in the competitive labor market. Some of our industrial giants—used to operating on a cost-plus basis—are going to find the "going" mighty tough in the hard field of competition. All these are normal readjustments.—*Mobile Labor Journal*.

Morgan Sued for \$100,000 Damages

Motorist Hits Scab Truck Stalled Across Highway

From The Indiana Teamster

IVAN MORGAN and partners in the Morgan Packing Co., of Austin, Ind., are being sued for \$100,000 damages by an Indianapolis realtor for personal injuries resulting from the asserted negligence of one of Morgan's non-union truck drivers.

The suit, filed April 3 in Marion County Superior Court, charges that the plaintiff, John C. Springer, suffered the loss of one eye and was otherwise permanently disabled when his automobile crashed into a Morgan semi-trailer on U. S. No. 31 near Westfield, Ind., at night.

The truck driver, John H. Pickett of Indianapolis, also named a defendant, is charged with failure to place warning flares near the truck.

The truck "was stalled across said U. S. Highway No. 31 in such a manner that the engine of said tractor truck was headed north, with the headlights pointing north, in the east lane, and the large trailer-truck attached was across the west lane at almost right angles to the highway, blocking the entire highway at this point for traffic, both north and south," according to the complaint.

The Morgan Packing Co. has long been notorious for its traffic accidents. In February, 1942, this paper reported, in quoting from an article in THE INTERNATIONAL TEAMSTER:

"How a non-union fleet of trucks left a trail of death and destruction across 22 states is written in the bloody statistics of an Indianapolis insurance agency (Hadley-Mahoney Insurance Agency).

"The statistics involve the operations of the Morgan Packing Co., of Austin, Ind., for the 11 months prior to last October 11.

"They show that during these 11 months the trucks of the Morgan Co., operated by scab drivers, were involved in 230 accidents. They killed eight people and injured 22.

They bumped into bridges, killed farm animals, turned over on the highway, and in several instances went bounding off the highways across the open fields."

Of the many suits resulting from Morgan's service, the present one charges that:

"The defendants did not place any lights, fuses, flares or warnings of any kind in front of said stalled trailer-truck to warn traffic coming from the north that said truck was across said highway and was disabled."

Consequently, says the affidavit, the defendants "did then and thereby negligently and unlawfully endanger the life, limb and property of the persons on said highway.

"That said plaintiff at said time (about 10:15 o'clock on the night of October 15, 1945), was driving a 1942 two-door Nash sedan in the west lane of U. S. Highway No. 31 in a southerly direction at approximately 45 miles per hour and when he saw the headlights of the stalled truck headed north.

"Thinking he was about to pass a car going in a northerly direction in the east lane, plaintiff slackened his speed to about 40 miles per hour, and, without any warning that said truck was stalled across the west lane of said highway, did then and there crash into said truck, demolishing the car in which he was driving and severely injuring this plaintiff."

Mr. Springer says in his complaint that he was in the Hamilton County Hospital, Noblesville, Ind., for three weeks, then in a sanitarium in Martinsville, Ind., for four weeks. He asserts:

"That the aforesaid negligent acts caused this plaintiff to suffer the following injuries:

"That the plaintiff lost the sight of the right eye; that the bones around both eyes were fractured; that the jaw bone was fractured, causing a paralysis of the right side

of his face and cheek; that said injuries impaired his hearing; broke several of his teeth and injured four teeth so that they will need to be removed; that it fractured the third vertebra, causing headaches; that he has a headache every day and is unable to sleep at night, and that as a result of the accident he has pains through the back of his head, neck and shoulders; that said accident has affected his speech and has caused a loss of memory; that the shoulder bone on his left side was fractured and deformed; that the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth,

seventh and eighth ribs were broken."

He details further injuries to his abdomen, knees and legs, and says he has lost 20 pounds as a result of the accident, adding:

"That he was so badly injured and for many days the pain was so great that he needed to be kept under hypodermics or narcotics; that he can not sleep at night, even at the present time, and is in a highly nervous condition; that he is totally and permanently disabled so that he cannot carry on his work and may never be able to work again."

Green Assails Taft-Ball-Smith Bill

THREE United States senators drew the fire of AFL President William Green for their effort to defeat the Wagner-Murray-Dingell national health bill by introducing a substitute.

Like most substitutes, it looks good until you examine it. Then you discover that instead of offering a national health program, it is actually trying to prevent one by killing the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

The following is what President Green said about it:

"Senator Taft of Ohio, together with Senators Smith of New Jersey and Ball of Minnesota, has introduced a so-called health bill as a substitute for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell National Health Act. This bill in no sense provides health insurance or anything like an adequate health program. It is simply a 1946 model 'poor law' extending the pernicious and outmoded method of relief to the field of providing medical care for the indigent.

"Its enactment would bring into operation the means test and send investigators prying into the private affairs and into the homes of workers in every community in the country.

"Though the bill provides for advisory councils, the provisions violate sound principles of government administration. I note,

too, that these councils are to be weighted heavily by membership drawn from those having a financial interest in the operation of the proposed program and against the representatives of the consuming public.

"Moreover, the bill proposes to subsidize with federal funds private health service agencies without providing any standards of performance or any representation by the recipients of medical care.

"Apparently the shocking health conditions revealed by the Selective Service examinations, the extensive revelations of the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, as well as the exhaustive studies carried on in this field by public and private agencies for the past ten years have failed completely to make an impression on the sponsors of this bill. They have turned a deaf ear to all the experts and hearkened only to the special pleading of the reactionary leadership of the American Medical Association.

"The working people of America will not accept the Taft-Ball-Smith substitute for health insurance because they want to go forward in their efforts to obtain adequate medical care and not backward. They will reject this proposal because they want health insurance on a self-sustaining basis—not charity and the dole."

"We urgently need at the moment neither America Firsters, Soviet Firsters nor Britain Firsters but rather those who see humanity as greater than any single race or nation," Educational Director Mark Starr told a session of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union-AFL Institute in Camden, N. J.

What Subsidies On Food Save You

Higher Prices Would Instantly Follow Ban on Payments

OPPONENTS of the OPA have opened an attack on food subsidies. The attack has not aroused the public reaction it should have, because so many people do not understand subsidies and what relation they have to keeping prices under control.

It is really very simple. Subsidies are payments made by the government to farmers and producers in order to increase production and hold prices down to the consumers.

This guarantees the farmer a higher price and the consumer a lower price. It benefits both. Big business interests, who resent any federal expenditures which do not benefit themselves exclusively, are behind the attack on subsidies, raising the cry of "extravagance" and "balancing the budget."

If subsidies are removed, prices will immediately increase to the consumer. They will not increase as much as though the OPA was abolished, but they will add several dollars a week to the family grocery bill.

Because of the public insistence that the OPA be retained, big business interests have shifted their attack to food subsidies on the theory that half a loaf is better than none.

If they can force prices up, they believe the public will become angered at the OPA and will be more likely to listen to demands to abolish it because "it has not kept prices down." It has kept prices down as low as Congress would permit it to do.

If subsidies are removed, Congress will be responsible for the resulting price increases. In order to show how much the public will pay without subsidies, the OPA has compiled the following list of price increases on articles of food.

This shows what subsidies mean to you. You can figure out exactly how much your congressmen and senators will take out of your pockets if they eliminate subsidies.

Remember these are only the increases that will come under OPA if subsidies are removed. If the OPA is abolished, the sky will be the limit.

SUBSIDIZED PRODUCTS	Price Increase If Subsidy Is Removed (Cents)
DAIRY PRODUCTS	
Butter, lb.	13.3
Cheddar cheese, lb.	12.3
Milk, fresh (delivered) qt.	1.3
Milk, fresh (store) qt.	1.3
Milk, evap., 14½ oz. can.	1.4
FATS AND OILS PROGRAM	
Shortening, other than lard,	
In cartons, lb.	0.4
In other containers, lb.	0.5
Salad dressing, pint.	1.2
Oleomargarine, lb.	4.0
FRUITS AND VEGETABLES PROGRAM	
Beans, green, No. 2 can.	1.2
Corn, No. 2 can.	0.9
Peas, No. 2 can.	2.2
Tomatoes, No. 2 can.	2.0
Prunes, lb.	4.2
Navy beans, lb.	0.7
FLOUR PRODUCTION PAYMENTS	
Flour, wheat, 10 lbs.	8.8
Macaroni, lb.96
Bread, white, lb.	1.0
Bread, whole wheat, lb.	1.0
Rye bread (increased cost of wheat ingredient), lb.	1.0
Vanilla cookies, lb.45
Soda crackers, lb.93
MEAT PROGRAM	
Round steak, lb.	9.1
Rib roast, lb.	8.0
Chuck roast, lb.	6.1
Hamburger, lb.	6.6
Veal cutlet, lb.	6.0
PORK	
Chops, lb.	6.0
Bacon, sliced, lb.	6.8
Ham, sliced, lb.	8.5
Ham, whole, lb.	5.9
Salt pork, lb.	3.7
LAMB	
Leg, lb.	7.2
Rib chops, lb.	3.8
SUGAR PROGRAM	
Sugar, lb.	1.4

Labor News Notes of the Month

(From the Federated Press)

SACRAMENTO, CAL.—A person who refuses to pass a picket line due to definite threats of violence is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits in California, according to a decision of the state re-employment commission's appeal board.

WASHINGTON—The Senate approved May 1 the nomination of William H. Hastie as governor of the Virgin Islands, making him the first Negro governor of an American territory. The islands have a population of 30,000, about 95 per cent of whom are Negroes. The nomination was opposed by Sen. Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana.

WASHINGTON—Ever since Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio stalked out of the health bill hearings in a huff several weeks ago, after an argument with the labor committee chairman, Sen. James E. Murray of Montana, the ball has been carried for opponents of the program by Forrest Donnell, Missouri Republican.

DES MOINES, IA.—Packers belonging to the American Meat Institute are more interested in slaughtering OPA than cattle, Pres. Fred Stover of the Iowa Farmers Union charged here.

MIAMI, FLA.—Rep. Pat Cannon of Miami—who voted for retaining the poll tax and getting rid of OPA, was right on only one out of ten votes on labor's yardstick and was absent on 18 key votes—was swept out in an avalanche of votes for labor-backed George Smather, a former marine. Thirty-two thousand Negroes voted in the Florida primaries.

WASHINGTON—Yielding to the pressure of outraged public opinion, the House reversed itself May 9 to restore the all-important building materials subsidy provision to the Patman housing bill.

WASHINGTON—Hearings on S. 1716, a bill to set up a Columbia Valley Authority, are scheduled before a Senate commerce subcommittee for the last week in June. The bill was introduced by Sen. Hugh B. Mitchell of Washington. It would provide a program of flood and erosion control, development of hydro-electric power, planting and terracing of watersheds and promote navigation and land reclamation. Area covered by the authority would include parts of Washington, Oregon, Montana and Idaho.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.—AFL Pres. William Green was deliberately cut off the air over the NBC national chain soon after starting his opening address at the southern organizational conference. Investigation in the basement of the city auditorium revealed that three of eleven wires in a control box leading to the public address system had been clipped. The three were the only wires needed for the radio hookup. Police said it was an "inside job." Green finished his 15-minute address without knowing he was speaking only to the southern delegates in the hall.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.—A resolution calling on AFL local unions in the South to affiliate with city central labor bodies and state federations of labor was adopted by the Southern Labor Conference. A high percentage of locals (estimated at 63 per cent) have no direct connection with these central bodies, it was noted.

WICHITA, KANS.—Just in case you've been hunting around for a definition of Fascism, here's a novel one offered by the Rev. Wylie to a meeting of the Christian Front here: "With Adolph Hitler, we had Fascism, which is naught but old-fashioned Americanism."

LOS ANGELES—Dummies dangling at the end of ropes on prominent street corners shocked citizens momentarily. This placard was on each: "This congressman committed political suicide. He voted against price control. Sez AVC." The stunt was part of the American Veterans' Committee observance of Save OPA Day.

CINCINNATI—Scabbing is an obscene word, Cincinnati police ruled as they grabbed a picket sign away from a World War II veteran.

DENVER—Fifty-six out of every 100 people in the U. S. believe that big industries could raise wages without increasing prices, according to a recent nation-wide survey of the National Opinion Research Center.

AFL Starts to Organize the South

Industry Mobilizes for Fight as Klan Rides Again

THE American Federation of Labor campaign to organize the South was formally inaugurated last month in Asheville, N. C., by a convention of 3,000 delegates from AFL unions representing some 1,800,000 members below the Mason-Dixon line.

President Green called the campaign "a great adventure," which it threatens to be.

The entrenched industrial interests, fattened on the cheap labor of the South, are planning to resist the organizational drive with every weapon at their disposal.

They will have help from the North because the North has heavy investments in southern industries, and the northern industrialists are anxious to see any fight against unionization successful anywhere in the country.

In fact, the industries of the North may be expected to start a few anti-union skirmishes of their own to keep the unions busy in other parts of the country and prevent them from concentrating their full resources on the South.

A forecast of this appeared recently when Teamster locals in the North attempted to renew contracts with companies with which long and harmonious relations have existed.

The contract renewals have been brusquely rejected with no word of explanation and with the attitude "strike if you don't like it."

These employers are inviting their employees to strike, obviously with the intention of stirring up as much industrial turmoil as possible.

Such turmoil will be beneficial in spurring Congress to enact repressive legislation that will retard the organizational campaign, not

only in the South, but in the rest of the country.

It appears, therefore, that the unions will face organized resistance on an unprecedented scale before the deplorable standard of living in the southern states can be increased through union contracts.

A more sinister aspect of the industrial resistance is the revival of the Ku Klux Klan, almost simultaneously with the labor campaign.

Under the pretext of "saving the South from Communism," the Klan is preparing to inject itself into the struggle to maintain the open shop.

Every union organizer will probably be branded a "Communist" as the Klan attempts to ride the crest of a wave of patriotic prejudice to organize the South itself and promote the sale of cotton fabrics woven into the hoods and shrouds of its official costume.

Thus the southern industrialists will profit both ways. They will keep wages low and sell cotton to the nightshirt cavalry.

President Green was right. It will be a great adventure with crosses burning on the mountain tops and Claghorns croaking in the swamps.

Perhaps this type of opposition and its ruthless tactics will drive labor together into some semblance of the solidarity which President Tobin has been advocating for many years.

If it does, the campaign will be speedily successful and the South will benefit by a greater prosperity than it has even enjoyed before.

The Day of Individual Action Has Departed

Make fun of the union if you will, abuse it if you must; call its officers names if that will relieve your feelings; stay out of it as long as you can, but eventually you will be forced to the inevitable conclusion that the day of individual action is over and its sun

has set and the day of collective, united, concerted action is at hand; for the good of one is bound up in the welfare of all.

Yes, today—organization is really a necessity!—*The Retail Clerk's International Advocate*.

Billion-Dollar Construction Increase

Wilson Wyatt Says Limitation Order Swells Building

A BILLION-DOLLAR increase in non-residential construction during 1946-47, even with the limitation order curtailing non-essential and deferrable projects, is scheduled under the veterans' emergency housing program, according to National Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt.

Moreover, current estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that at the peak of the housing program in 1947 almost twice as many workers will be needed for non-residential construction as are now employed in that type of building.

In other words, there will be *more*, NOT *less*, employment, building and investment in the heavy-construction non-residential fields, Mr. Wyatt emphasized. Fears that the limitation order signifies a stoppage of heavy-construction building are unfounded and based on a misunderstanding of the order and the building program.

"The program calls for a greatly accelerated production of building materials," Mr. Wyatt explained. "While the bulk of this increased production will go into home building, some of it will go into essential non-residential construction.

"So, actually, the program will stimulate a larger volume of non-housing construction than we would have had without the program."

The effect of the limitation order, he explained, will be to screen out non-essential and deferrable commercial and industrial construction such as night clubs, race tracks and motion picture theaters. On the other hand, materials and manpower will be made available to essential projects such as schools, hospitals, highways, streets, sewers and other utilities needed in support of the housing program as well as industrial plants producing needed materials or providing needed employment.

Mr. Wyatt cited latest Bureau of Labor Statistics employment figures both for on-

site residential construction and for all other construction. In April, the bureau reported, 360,000 workers were employed on-site in home building and 800,000 were employed on-site in all other new construction.

By next September, expected peak month for 1946, the bureau estimated that 975,000 on-site workers will be required for the Wyatt home-building program and 900,000 for all other new construction. And at the 1947 peak, 1,100,000 will be needed for the veterans' emergency housing program and 1,500,000 for all other new construction.

Non-residential construction, repairs and maintenance—WITHOUT the program and limitation order—were estimated to reach \$22 billion in 1946-47. Thus, the present goal of \$23 billion represents a 4 per cent greater volume than there would be without the emergency program. And, at the same time, the emergency program and the limitation order will assure 65 per cent more home-building than there would be without the program and the order.

A huge volume of heavy construction work which was under way before March 26, date of the limitation order, is not affected by the order. That work will continue, and is expected to provide a backlog for some months of employment for heavy construction workers. As the months go by, it is expected that building materials will become much more plentiful—and that as they become more plentiful, prohibitions against non-essential construction can be relaxed.

Of the 2,700,000 dwelling units to be started before the end of 1947 under the veterans' emergency housing program, a large number will be in the form of large apartment houses and multiple-dwelling projects. These large-scale projects will also add to the demand for many types of heavy construction workers.

House Attempts to Kill OPA

JUST before the May issue of THE INTERNATIONAL TEAMSTER went to press, the lower house of Congress attempted to kill the OPA by adopting a list of amendments paving the way for uncontrolled inflation.

The House bill then went to the Senate, where it was held up by a storm of protest throughout the country. The Senate did not dare to pass the bill as it stood because of the deluge of letters and telegrams favoring the OPA which poured in on the individual senators from their constituents.

One of the worst amendments passed by the House was one by Congressman Jesse P. Wolcott of Port Huron, Michigan. It would revive the old cost-plus racket by which contractors grew rich during the war.

The Wolcott amendment guarantees all manufacturers, producers, distributors and retailers all their costs plus a "reasonable" profit. This amendment would blow the price ceilings off everything.

We are printing the record on this amendment, showing who was for and who was against it. The list includes those who were paired specifically for and against this amendment.

It also shows who supported labor on the Hobbs bill and the Case bill.

As President Tobin instructed the Western Conference of Teamsters in April, the men and women who fought for labor on the Hobbs bill and the Case bill must be sent back to Congress "to continue the great work they have done for us."

The following list shows those men and women who voted for labor on the OPA and also on the Hobbs and Case bills. They are entitled to the united backing of labor in their campaign for re-election. Every member of Congress with double asterisks in the following list of those supporting the OPA has won the right to every help that labor can give him.

These Voted for Labor on OPA

* Indicates those supporting labor on either Hobbs Bill or Case Bill

** Indicates those supporting labor on both Hobbs and Case Bills

ALABAMA

Democrats

Luther Patrick, Birmingham.**
John J. Sparkman, Huntsville.

ARIZONA

Democrat

John R. Murdock, Tempe.*

ARKANSAS

Democrats

Brooks Hays, Little Rock.
James W. Trimble, Berryville.

CALIFORNIA

Democrats

Ned R. Healy, Los Angeles.**
Franck R. Havenner, San Francisco.**
George E. Outland, Santa Barbara.**
Helen Gahagan Douglas, Los Angeles.**
Clyde Doyle, Long Beach.**
Chet Holifield, Montebello.**

Ed V. Izac, San Diego.**

Ellis E. Patterson, Los Angeles.**

Cecil R. King, Los Angeles.*

John H. Tolan, Oakland.*

Jerry Voorhis, San Dimas.*

Republican

Richard J. Welch, San Francisco.*

COLORADO

None.

CONNECTICUT

Democrats

Joseph F. Ryter, Hartford.**

Herman P. Koppleman, Hartford.**

Chase Going Woodhouse, New London.**

James P. Geelan, New Haven.**

DELAWARE

Democrat

Philip A. Traynor, Wilmington.**

FLORIDA**Democrat**

Pat Cannon, Miami.

GEORGIA**Democrat**

Helen Douglas Mankin, Atlanta.

IDAHO**None.****ILLINOIS****Democrats**

Emily Taft Douglas, Chicago.**

William L. Dawson, Chicago.**

Martin Gorski, Chicago.**

Thomas J. O'Brien, Chicago.**

William W. Link, Chicago.**

Thomas S. Gordon, Chicago.**

Alexander J. Resa, Chicago.**

Melvin Price, East St. Louis.**

INDIANA**Democrats**

Louis Ludlow, Indianapolis.**

Ray J. Madden, Gary.**

Republican

Charles M. La Follette, Evansville.**

IOWA**None.****KANSAS****None.****KENTUCKY****Democrats**

Brent Spence, Fort Thomas.**

Joe B. Bates, Greenup.**

Virgil Chapman, Bourbon County.

Noble J. Gregory, Mayfield.

Andrew J. May, Prestonsburg.

LOUISIANA**Democrat**

James H. Morrison, Hammond.*

MAINE**Republican**

Margaret Chase Smith, Showhegan.*

MARYLAND**Democrats**

Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Baltimore.*

George H. Fallon, Baltimore.

Lansdale G. Sasscer, Upper Marlboro.

MASSACHUSETTS**Democrats**

John W. McCormack, Dorchester.**

Thomas J. Lane, Lawrence.**

James M. Curley, Boston.

MICHIGAN**Democrats**

George G. Sadowski, Detroit.**

Frank E. Hook, Ironwood.**

George D. O'Brien, Detroit.**

Louis C. Rabaut, Grosse Pointe Park.**

John Lesinski, Dearborn.**

John D. Dingell, Detroit.**

MINNESOTA**Democrats**

William J. Gallagher, Minneapolis.**

Frank T. Starkey, St. Paul.**

MISSISSIPPI**None.****MISSOURI****Democrats**

Clarence Cannon, Elsberry.**

A. S. J. Carnahan, Ellsinore.**

John B. Sullivan, St. Louis.**

Orville Zimmerman, Kennett.

MONTANA**Democrat**

Michael J. Mansfield, Missoula.**

NEBRASKA**None.****NEVADA****None.****NEW HAMPSHIRE****None.****NEW JERSEY****Democrats**

Edward J. Hart, Jersey City.**

Mary Teresa Norton, Jersey City.

Republicans

Gordon Canfield, Paterson.*

Charles A. Wolverton, Camden.*

Robert W. Kean, Livingston.

NEW YORK**Democrats**

George F. Rogers, Rochester.**

William T. Byrne, Albany County.**

Peter A. Quinn, New York City.**

Benjamin J. Rabin, New York City.**
 Walter A. Lynch, New York City.**
 Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York City.**
 James H. Torrens, New York City.**
 Charles A. Buckley, Bronx.**
 Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn.**
 Leo F. Rayfiel, Brooklyn.**
 Donald L. O'Toble, Brooklyn.**
 James J. Rooney, Brooklyn.**
 James J. Heffernan, Brooklyn.**
 Eugene J. Keogh, Brooklyn.**
 John J. Delaney, Brooklyn.**
 James J. Delaney, Long Island City.**
 William B. Barry, Queens County.*
 James A. Roe, Flushing.*
 Joseph L. Pfeifer, Brooklyn.*
 Andrew L. Somers, Brooklyn.*
 Sol Bloom, New York City.*
 Arthur G. Klein, New York City.

Republican

Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York City.**

American Labor

Vito Marcantonio, New York City.**

NORTH CAROLINA

Democrats

J. Bayard Clark, Fayetteville.
 John H. Folger, Mount Airy.
 A. L. Bulwinkle, Gastonia.

NORTH DAKOTA

None.

OHIO

Democrats

Robert Crosser, Cleveland.**
 Michael A. Feighan, Cleveland.**
 Michael J. Kirwan, Youngstown.**
 William R. Thom, Canton.**
 Walter B. Huber, Akron.**

OKLAHOMA

Democrat

A. S. Monroney, Oklahoma City.

OREGON

None.

PENNSYLVANIA

Democrats

William A. Barrett, Philadelphia.**
 Michael J. Bradley, Philadelphia.**
 Daniel J. Flood, Wilkes-Barre.**
 William T. Granahan, Philadelphia.**
 William J. Green, Jr., Philadelphia.**

Daniel K. Hoch, Reading.**
 Augustine B. Kelley, Greensburg.**
 Herbert J. McGlinchey, Philadelphia.**
 Thomas E. Morgan, Fredericktown.**
 John W. Murphy, Dunmore.**
 John E. Sheridan, Philadelphia.**
 Francis E. Walter, Easton.*
 Herman P. Eberharter, Pittsburgh.*

Republicans

John C. Kunkel, Harrisburg.*
 James G. Fulton, Pittsburgh.*

RHODE ISLAND

Democrats

Aime J. Forand, Cumberland.**
 John E. Fogarty, Harmony.**

SOUTH CAROLINA

None.

SOUTH DAKOTA

None.

TENNESSEE

Democrats

Estes Kefauver, Chattanooga.*
 Albert A. Gore, Carthage.
 James P. Priest, Nashville.
 Wirt Courtney, Franklin.
 Jere Cooper, Dyersburg.

TEXAS

Democrats

J. M. Combs, Beaumont.*
 Lindley Beckworth, Upshur County.
 Wright Patman, Texarkana.
 Luther A. Johnson, Corsicana.
 Lyndon B. Johnson, Johnson City.
 John E. Lyle, Jr., Corpus Christi.
 Robert E. Thomason, El Paso.

UTAH

Democrats

Walter K. Granger, Cedar City.**
 J. W. Robinson, Provo.**

VERMONT

None.

VIRGINIA

Democrats

Schuyler O. Bland, Newport News.
 Patrick H. Drewry, Petersburg.
 A. Willis Robertson, Lexington.

WASHINGTON**Democrats**

Hugh De Lacy, Seattle.**
 Charles R. Savage, Shelton.**
 Henry M. Jackson, Everett.**
 John M. Coffee, Tacoma.*

WEST VIRGINIA**Democrats**

Matthew M. Neely, Fairmount.**

Cleveland M. Bailey, Clarksburg.**
 John Kee, Bluefield.**

WISCONSIN**Democrats**

Andrew J. Biemiller, Milwaukeee.**
 Thad F. Wasielewski, Milwaukee.*

Progressive

Merlin Hull, Black River Falls.**

These Members Want Still Higher Prices

Following is a list of members of Congress who passed the Wolcott amendment to the OPA bill, removing all existing price ceilings. It applies the "cost plus" racket to the OPA.

Every member on the following list was against labor on this vital question. The Wolcott amendment, and others adopted by

this reactionary alliance, would cut your pay check in two by drastic increases in the cost of everything you buy.

Some of those who voted against labor on this amendment were for labor on the Hobbs or Case bills. The asterisks show who they were. Those without asterisks have been consistently against labor.

ALABAMA**Democrats**

George W. Andrews, Union Springs.
 Frank W. Boykin, Mobile.
 George M. Grant, Troy.
 Sam Hobbs, Selma.
 Carter Manasco, Jasper.

ARIZONA**Democrat**

Richard F. Harless, Phoenix.*

ARKANSAS**Democrats**

Fadjo Cravens, Fort Smith.
 Ezekiel C. Gathings, West Memphis.
 Oren Harris, El Dorado.*
 Wilbur D. Mills, Kensett.
 W. F. Norrell, Monticello.

CALIFORNIA**Democrats**

Alfred J. Elliott, Tulare.
 Clair Engle, Red Bluff.*
 Clarence F. Lea, Santa Rosa.

Republicans

Carl Hinshaw, Pasadena.
 Jack Z. Anderson, San Juan Bautista.
 Bertrand W. Gearhart, Fresno.
 J. Leroy Johnson, Stockton.*
 Gordon L. McDonough, Los Angeles.**
 John Phillips, Banning.

COLORADO**Republicans**

J. Edgar Chenoweth, Trinidad.*
 Dean M. Gillespie, Denver.
 William S. Hill, Fort Collins.
 Robert F. Rockwell, Paonia.

CONNECTICUT**Republican**

Joseph E. Talbot, Naugatuck.

DELAWARE**None.****FLORIDA****Democrats**

Joe Hendricks, De Land.
 Emory H. Price, Jacksonville.
 Dwight L. Rogers, Fort Lauderdale.
 Robert L. F. Sikes, Crestview.

GEORGIA**Democrats**

Paul Brown, Elberton.
 Albert S. Camp, Newnan.
 Edward E. Cox, Camilla.
 Stephen Pace, Americus.
 Hugh Peterson, Ailey.
 Malcolm C. Tarver, Dalton.
 Carl Vinson, Milledgeville.
 John S. Wood, Canton.

IDAHO

Republican

Henry C. Dworshak, Burley.

ILLINOIS

Democrat

Edward A. Kelly, Chicago.**

Republicans

Leo E. Allen, Galena.
 Leslie C. Arends, Melvin.
 C. W. Bishop, Carterville.**
 Robert B. Chipfield, Canton.
 Ralph E. Church, Evanston.
 Roy Clippinger, Carmi.
 Everett M. Dirksen, Pekin.
 Evan Howell, Springfield.**
 Anton J. Johnson, Macomb.
 Rolla C. McMillen, Decatur.
 Noah M. Mason, Oglesby.
 Chauncey W. Reed, West Chicago.
 Sid Simpson, Greene County.
 Jessie Sumner, Milford.
 Charles W. Vursell, Salem.

INDIANA

Republicans

George W. Gillie, Fort Wayne.
 Robert A. Grant, South Bend.
 Charles A. Halleck, Rensselaer.
 Forest A. Harness, Kokomo.
 Noble J. Johnson, Terre Haute.
 Gerald W. Landis, Linton.
 Raymond S. Springer, Connersville.
 Earl Wilson, Huron.

IOWA

Republicans

Paul Cunningham, Des Moines.
 James I. Dolliver, Fort Dodge.
 John W. Gwynne, Waterloo.
 Charles B. Hoeven, Alton.
 Ben Franklin Jensen, Exira.
 Karl M. Le Compte, Corydon.
 Thomas E. Martin, Iowa City.
 Henry O. Talle, Decorah.

KANSAS

Republicans

Albert M. Cole, Jackson County.
 Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas City.
 Thomas D. Winter, Girard.
 Edward H. Rees, Lyon County.
 Clifford R. Hope, Garden City.
 Frank Carlson, Concordia.

KENTUCKY

Democrats

Frank L. Chelf, Marion County.
 Earle C. Clements, Morganfield.**

Republican

John M. Robsion, Knox County.

LOUISIANA

Democrats

F. Edward Hebert, New Orleans.
 Paul H. Maloney, New Orleans.
 James Domengeaux, Lafayette.
 Overton Brooks, Shreveport.
 Charles E. McKenzie, Monroe.
 Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Opelousas.**
 A. Leonard Allen, Winnfield.

MAINE

Republicans

Robert Hale, Portland.
 Frank Fellows, Bangor.

MARYLAND

Democrats

Dudley G. Roe, Sudlersville.
 H. Streett Baldwin, Hydes.

Republican

James G. Beall, Frostburg.

MASSACHUSETTS

Democrat

Philip J. Philbin, Clinton.**

Republicans

John W. Heselton, Deerfield.
 Charles R. Clason, Springfield.
 Pehr G. Holmes, Worcester.
 Edith Nourse Rogers, Lowell.
 George J. Bates, Salem.
 Angier L. Goodwin, Melrose.
 Charles L. Gifford, Barnstable.
 Christian A. Herter, Boston.
 Richard B. Wigglesworth, Milton.
 Joseph W. Martin, North Attleboro.

MICHIGAN

Republicans

Earl C. Michener, Adrian.
 Bartel J. Jonkman, Grand Rapids.
 William W. Blackney, Flint.
 Jesse P. Wolcott, Port Huron.
 Fred L. Crawford, Saginaw.
 Fred Bradley, Rogers City.*
 Roy O. Woodruff, Bay City.
 Paul W. Shafer, Battle Creek.

George A. Dondero, Royal Oak.
 Albert J. Engel, Muskegon.*
 Clare E. Hoffman, Allegan.*

MINNESOTA

Republicans

August H. Andresen, Red Wing.
 H. Carl Andersen, Tyler.
 Harold C. Hagen, Crookston.*
 Walter H. Judd, Minneapolis.
 Harold Knutson, St. Cloud.
 Joseph P. O'Hara, Glencoe.
 William A. Pittenger, Duluth.*

MISSISSIPPI

Democrats

John E. Rankin, Tupelo.
 Jamie L. Whitten, Charleston.
 William M. Whittington, Greenwood.
 Thomas G. Abernethy, Okolona.
 William A. Winstead, Philadelphia.
 Dan R. McGehee, Meadville.

MISSOURI

Democrats

Roger C. Slaughter, Kansas City.
 Charles J. Bell, Blue Springs.*

Republicans

Wat Arnold, Kirksville.
 Max Schwabe, Columbia.
 William C. Cole, St. Joseph.**
 Marion T. Bennett, Springfield.
 Dewey Short, Galena.
 Walter C. Ploeser, St. Louis County.

MONTANA

Republican

Wesley A. D'Ewart, Park County.*

NEBRASKA

Republicans

Carl T. Curtis, Minden.
 Howard H. Buffett, Omaha.
 Karl Stefan, Norfolk.
 Arthur L. Miller, Kimball.

NEVADA

None.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Republicans

Chester E. Merrow, Center Ossipee.
 Sherman Adams, Lincoln.

NEW JERSEY

Republicans

T. Millet Hand, Cape May.

James C. Auchincloss, Rumson.
 Clifford P. Case, Rahway.*
 Frank A. Mathews, Jr., Riverton.
 Charles A. Eaton, Somerset County.
 J. Parnell Thomas, Allendale.
 Harry L. Towe, Rutherford.
 Fred A. Hartley, Jr., Kearny.
 Frank L. Sundstrom, East Orange.

NEW MEXICO

Democrat

Antonio M. Fernandez, Santa Fe.

NEW YORK

Republicans

Leonard W. Hall, Oyster Bay.
 Ellsworth B. Buck, Staten Island.
 Ralph Waldo Gwinn, Bronxville.
 Ralph A. Gamble, Larchmont.
 Jay LeFevre, New Paltz.
 Clarence E. Kilburn, Malone.
 Hadwen C. Fuller, Oswego County.
 Clarence E. Hancock, Syracuse.
 John Taber, Auburn.
 W. Sterling Cole, Bath.
 James W. Wadsworth, Geneseo.
 Walter G. Andrews, Buffalo.
 Daniel A. Reed, Dunkirk.
 John C. Butler, Buffalo.**
 Edward J. Elsaesser, Buffalo.*
 Edwin Arthur Hall, Binghamton.*
 Bernard W. Kearney, Gloversville.*
 Dean P. Taylor, Troy.
 Augustus W. Bennet, Newburgh.
 Henry J. Latham, Queens Village.*

NORTH CAROLINA

Democrats

Graham A. Barden, New Bern.
 Herbert C. Bonner, Washington.
 Harold D. Cooley, Nashville.
 Robert L. Doughton, Laurel Springs.
 Carl T. Durham, Chapel Hill.
 Sam Ervin, Jr., Morganton.
 John H. Kerr, Warrenton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Republicans

Charles R. Robertson, Bismarck.
 William Lemke, Fargo.*

OHIO

Democrat

Edward J. Gardner, Hamilton.**

Republicans

George H. Bender, Cleveland Heights.*

Frances P. Bolton, Lyndhurst.
 Walter E. Brehm, Logan.
 Clarence J. Brown, Blanchester.
 Cliff Clevenger, Bryan.
 Charles H. Elston, Cincinnati.
 P. W. Griffiths, Marietta.
 William E. Hess, Cincinnati.
 Thomas A. Jenkins, Ironton.*
 Earl R. Lewis, St. Clairsville.*
 Edward O. McCowen, Wheelersburg.
 J. Harry McGregor, West Lafayette.
 Homer A. Ramey, Toledo.*
 Frederick C. Smith, Marion.
 John M. Vorys, Columbus.
 Alvin F. Weichel, Sandusky.

OKLAHOMA**Democrats**

Lyle H. Boren, Seminole.
 William G. Stigler, Stigler.
 Paul Stewart, Antlers.
 Jed Johnson, Anadarko.
 Victor Wickersham, Mangum.

Republicans

Ross Rizley, Guymon.
 George B. Schwabe, Tulsa.

OREGON**Republicans**

Homer D. Angell, Portland.*
 Harris Ellsworth, Roseburg.
 Lowell Stockman, Pendleton.
 Walter Norblad, Astoria.

PENNSYLVANIA**Republicans**

David E. Brumbaugh, Claysburg.
 Howard E. Campbell, Pittsburgh.
 Robert J. Corbett, Pittsburgh.*
 Ivor D. Fenton, Mahanoy City.*
 Leon H. Gavin, Oil City.
 Charles L. Gerlach, Allentown.
 Wilson D. Gillette, Towanda.
 Louis E. Graham, Beaver.
 Chester H. Gross, York.
 J. Roland Kinzer, Lancaster.
 Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Penn Wynne.
 Robert F. Rich, Clinton County.
 Robert L. Rodgers, Erie.
 Richard M. Simpson, Huntingdon.
 Harve Tibbot, Cambria County.
 James Wolfenden, Upper Darby.

RHODE ISLAND

None.

SOUTH CAROLINA**Democrats**

John L. McMillan, Florence.
 L. Mendel Rivers, Charleston.
 John J. Riley, Sumter.
 James P. Richards, Lancaster.
 Joseph R. Bryson, Greenville.
 Butler B. Hare, Saluda.

SOUTH DAKOTA**Republicans**

Francis Case, Custer.
 Karl E. Mundt, Madison.

TENNESSEE**Democrats**

Harold H. Earthman, Murfreesboro.
 Tom Murray, Jackson.

Republican

John Jennings, Jr., Knoxville.

TEXAS**Democrats**

Hatton W. Sumners, Dallas.
 Albert Thomas, Houston.*
 Tom Pickett, Palestine.
 Fritz G. Lanham, Fort Worth.
 William R. Poage, Waco.
 Ed Gossett, Wichita Falls.
 Milton H. West, Brownsville.
 Sam M. Russell, Erath County.
 George H. Mahon, Colorado City.
 Eugene Worley, Shamrock.
 Paul J. Kilday, San Antonio.

UTAH

None.

VERMONT**Republican**

Charles A. Plumley, Northfield.

VIRGINIA

None.

VIRGINIA**Democrats**

John W. Flannagan, Jr., Bristol.*
 Ralph H. Daughton, Norfolk.
 J. Vaughan Gary, Richmond.
 Thomas G. Burch, Henry County.
 Howard W. Smith, Alexandria.
 J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Roanoke.

WASHINGTON**Republicans**

Hal Holmes, Ellensburg.
Walt Horan, Wenatchee.

WEST VIRGINIA**Democrats**

Jennings Randolph, Elkins.**
Erland H. Hedrick, Beckley.**

Republican

Hubert S. Ellis, Huntington.

WISCONSIN**Republicans**

Frank B. Keefe, Oshkosh.
Reid F. Murray, Ogdensburg.
Alvin E. O'Konski, Mercer.**
William H. Stevenson, La Crosse.
Lawrence H. Smith, Racine.
John W. Byrnes, Green Bay.

WYOMING**Republican**

Frank A. Barrett, Lusk.

Expense Accounts Should Be Itemized

By DANIEL J. TOBIN

THIS is to advise you that your conscience in handling the moneys of your employer or the moneys of your organization must be your guide.

A man is born honest or he is born with the tendencies of becoming a thief.

Men and women throughout the world excuse themselves from penny-ante thievery by saying to themselves that they need the money, but every one of us knows in his own heart when he is cheating.

For instance, we may charge an expense to our unions that is not legitimate. You may be allowed \$10 a day for expenses when you are travelling away from your home city, but that \$10 per day should be expended in the interest of the union or in legitimate expense.

Some of our local representatives come to Indianapolis or Washington and they put in a lump sum for their expenses, which is not itemized. This is absolutely wrong and dishonest.

As far as we know, we have not in the service of the International or of our local unions a really dishonest individual.

Insofar as our locals are concerned, we cannot itemize the bills of their officers. The local trustees should do this, and the local trustees or the local union should not be

miserly in legitimate expenses, but it is their duty to ask for and receive an honest statement of moneys expended.

The income tax division of the federal government can also require an accounting of expenses. Some time ago the federal income tax division went over my income tax reports covering a period of five or six years.

I had been reported by someone almost bordering on a degenerate who at one time was connected with the International Union. When reports go in to the income tax division and continue to be sent in month after month by one of your enemies, there is no alternative except for the income tax division to look into your income tax returns.

I, however, was somewhat fortunate, because the government refunded me three or four hundred dollars which I had paid over and above the amount due the government.

I, therefore, advise you, first, from the standpoint of your conscience, your decency, your manhood and the respect of your family, not to overcharge your organization on expenses; to be honest with your organization as I know you are, and, next, don't for one moment believe that you can deceive the federal government on your income tax returns, especially on what they may decide is an unusual expense charge.

Statistics show that the tobacco manufacturing companies made profits of over \$154,000,000 last year, and since their production is increasing this year, their profits will be greater than ever. Fifty-eight per cent of all tobacco workers receive less than 65¢ per hour. Certainly the tobacco corporations can well afford a wage increase.—*Cigar Makers' Official Journal*.

Home Crisis is Danger Sign

AN EMINENT CLERGYMAN has proposed that the government pay the inflated cost of homes. According to his plan a purchaser would pay what the house is actually worth and the government would make up the difference.

Every home purchased, therefore, would cost the government from \$3,000 to \$10,000, or more.

If anyone but the clergyman had made such a suggestion he would have been instantly branded as "a dangerous Communist" seeking to bankrupt the federal treasury and to destroy "the American way of life."

Perhaps the clergyman's proposal is preposterous, according to orthodox theories of financing and taxation. Certainly it would cost billions of dollars and raise taxes to new heights.

But it would make it possible for millions of desperate families to find homes. From a social standpoint, the clergyman undoubtedly estimates that it would be worth all it cost.

He must interpret "the American way of life" to mean that every American family is entitled to a home.

How can the average American family have a home when the average annual income last year, even swollen by war wages and overtime, was only \$1,800? How can a family earning \$34.62 per week spend \$6,000 or \$8,000 for a home? But try to get anything cheaper!

The answer is that millions of families do not have homes of their own. They cannot even find houses or apartments to rent.

They are doubling up, or living in tents, sheds or trailers. The divorce rate skyrockets as homes break under the strain of domestic hardships. And the juvenile delinquency rate continues to rise.

The clergyman was thinking of that!

So he proposed a radical solution for a radical problem. It is, indeed, a radical problem, for it is from the ranks of such suffering people that Communism recruits its converts. What have they to lose? They'll take a chance on anything that promises to relieve their misery.

The complete and contemptible failure of Congress to solve this problem has contributed to its severity. In reality, Congress has made it more difficult for people to own homes by refusing to put a ceiling on existing houses to halt speculation. In doing so, it has forced home prices up.

And at the same time, by restricting the OPA, it has forced up general prices and thereby reduced the income of everyone.

With income going down and prices going up, how can the average family buy a home? It can't.

Maybe the clergyman has the right answer. Unless somebody finds an answer soon there will be a social eruption that will blow the top off the shaky structure of the competitive system—which has come to mean that monopolies compete for profits while the masses compete for homes.

WEAR THE EMBLEM OF OUR ORGANIZATION

THE CUTS

SHOWN REPRESENT

Button, Watch Fob and Cuff Buttons

SOLD BY THE GENERAL OFFICE



The prices are as follows:

Gold Plated Buttons (Sterling Silver)	\$.50 apiece
14-K Solid Gold Buttons	2.50 apiece
Cuff Buttons	1.00 a pair
Watch Charms	2.00 apiece

All Members should have a copy of the International Constitution and Laws. . . . Copies, 5 cents each

Order through your Local



All orders should be sent through the Secretary of the Local Union to


GENERAL SECRETARY-TREASURER

222 EAST MICHIGAN STREET

INDIANAPOLIS 4, INDIANA

UNION SERVICE

INTERNATIONAL
BROTHERHOOD
of TEAMSTERS
CHAUFFEURS



WAREHOUSEMEN
AND HELPERS
OF
AMERICA

Affiliated with

A.F. of L.

Daniel J. Tolson, General President

John M. Gillespie, Gen'l Secy-Treasurer

THIS IS THE PROPERTY OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA

This is the standard union service sign officially approved for all branches of the Teamsters' Union. Order them from the general secretary-treasurer. The signs are of metal, 7 by 11 inches in size. They cost 25 cents each.